

## **REMARKS**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendments in this application because the amendment to claim 1 merely addresses the minor antecedent basis issue. Thus, the amendment does not require any additional search or consideration.

### **II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the recited limitation “the basic cross-sectional area.” (See 3/17/08 Office Action, p. 2.) Claim 1 has been amended and now recites the limitation “the basic cross-sectional area of the first portion,” for which there is proper antecedent basis. In view of this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

### **III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by International Publication WO 01/39937 to Santhagens Van Eibergen et al. (hereinafter “Eibergen”). (See *id.*, pp. 2-3.)

Claim 1, as amended, recites “[a] shaving head comprising at least two blade-shaped cutting members each having a straight cutting edge extending parallel to a longitudinal direction of the shaving head, each cutting member being supported in a cartridge of the shaving head by a

supporting member supporting the respective cutting member in a supported area on the respective cutting member, said supported area extending over a predetermined distance perpendicular to the longitudinal direction, and each supporting member having a first portion in contact with said supported area remote from the cutting edge of the respective cutting member and a second portion in contact with said supported area near the cutting edge of the respective cutting member, said first portion having a basic cross-sectional area, seen perpendicularly to the longitudinal direction, and said second portion having a reduced cross-sectional area compared to the basic cross-sectional area of the first portion, wherein the second portion of the supporting member of at least one of the cutting members extends over at least half of said predetermined distance.”

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misinterpreted the claim language in comparing it to Eibergen. In supporting the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 over Eibergen, the Examiner provides a marked copy of Fig. 2 of Eibergen. (See id., p. 3.) The marked copy shows the blade 5 supported by a supporting area including a first portion and a second portion. (See id.) The Examiner asserts that the second portion has a reduced cross-sectional area compared to the first portion. (See id., p. 4.) The Examiner further asserts that “the second portion... does extend over half of the cutting member...” (Id.)

The Applicants respectfully submit that this latter assertion is both irrelevant and incorrect. First, the Examiner’s assertion that the second portion extends over half of the cutting member, as cited above, is irrelevant because it changes the claim language. Claim 1 recites “wherein the second portion of the supporting member of at least one of the cutting members *extends over at least half of said predetermined distance.*” The recitation of claim 1 previously defines the predetermined distance as “said supported area extending over a predetermined distance.” In other words, claim 1 recites that the second portion extends over at least half of the supported area.

Further, the Figure provided by the Examiner clearly indicates that Eibergen does not disclose the claimed limitation “said supported area extending over a predetermined distance... wherein the second portion of the supporting member of at least one of the cutting members

extends over at least half of said predetermined distance.” Rather, the Examiner’s own markings on Fig. 2 of Eibergen clearly show that the second portion extends over *less than* half of the supported area. (See *id.*, p. 3.) Therefore, Eibergen does not disclose “wherein the second portion of the supporting member of at least one of the cutting members extends over at least half of said predetermined difference,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2, 4 and 6 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

#### **IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eibergen as applied to claim 1 above, in view of U.S. Patent 5,822,862 to Ferraro (hereinafter “Ferraro”). (See 3/17/08 Office Action, pp. 3-4.)


Ferraro does not disclose a supporting member with a first portion and a second portion as recited in claim 1, and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Eibergen described above with reference to claim 1. Because claims 3 and 5 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 2, 2008

By:   
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, New York 10038  
Tel.: (212) 619-6000  
Fax: (212) 619-0276